

### III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-15, 18-22 and 24 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 13 and 24 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. In the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 14, 21, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Riemers (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,242), hereafter “Riemers,” in view of Hurst *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,996,845), hereafter “Hurst.” Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Riemers in view of Hurst *et al.* and further in view of Tarbotton *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,830), hereafter “Tarbotton.” Claims 10-12 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Riemers in view of Hurst and further in view of Van Andel *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,456), hereafter “Van Andel.”

Applicants assert that the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 5 and 13, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest that the message includes information for constructing the query that includes information entered by a user into a web page provided by the server directly incorporated therein. The Office admits that Riemers does not teach this feature. Instead, the passage of Hurst cited by the Office describes “...allow[ing] a user to create an HTTP or HTTPS request from either an existing request that has already been

sent [sic] to the server or to create a new request on the fly.” To this extent, the user in Hurst is allowed to create an HTTP or HTTPS request. However, Hurst does not indicate that the request includes information entered by a user into a web page provided by the server directly incorporated therein.

In contrast, the claimed invention includes “...the message including the information for constructing the query that includes information entered by a user into a web page provided by the server directly incorporated therein.” Claim 1. As such, the claimed invention operates in an environment in which information entered by a user into a web page provided by a server is directly incorporated into a query, and is not merely in an HTTP or HTTPS request as in Hurst. Thus, the environment of the claimed invention is not taught by Hurst. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claims 1, 5 and 13, Applicants respectfully submits that the cited references also fail to teach the message types of the claimed invention. Rather, the passages of Riemers cited by the Office discuss analyzing a particular message and not to retrieving all types of messages that are associated with the execution program set that will be processing the particular message. This misunderstanding is further reflected in the Office action in which it is stated that “retrieving an identification of message associated with the execution program set” is taught and not retrieving an identification of all message types.

The claimed invention, in contrast, includes “...retrieving identification of all message types associated with said execution program set; examining said message received by said server in relation to said message types associated with said execution program set; and determining if said message received by said server contains an unauthorized element in relation

to the corresponding message type for said message received.” Claim 1. As such, the claimed invention does not merely analyze a message as does Riemers, but instead, determines if a message contains an unauthorized element in relation to an corresponding message *type* for the message received. This is accomplished, in part, by retrieving identification of all message types associated with the execution program set that is used to process the message. For the above reasons, the analyzing of the message of Riemers does not teach the message type of the claimed invention. Hurst does not cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 24, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest that the query is a database query that includes an entirety of the information entered by the user into a field of the web page. In contrast, the passages of Riemers cited by the Office merely teach a URL message and not a query that includes an entirety of the information entered by a user into a field of a web page. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office’s rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection as a whole, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion or motivation for combining the references. For example, Riemers is concerned with identifying spam email. Abstract, Fig. 1. To this extent, the elements of Riemers referenced by the Office function for this purpose. In contrast, Hurst and the elements thereof referenced by the Office function for the purpose of analysis of a web cite to determine whether there are security vulnerabilities. Abstract. As such, is it unclear that combining the message search and creation elements of Hurst with Riemers would better enable Riemers to perform its task of detecting spam, much less enable it to determine whether information used to construct a query of server

information contains unauthorized content. Thus, the result of the combination of Hurst and Riemers is unpredictable and would require undue experimentation in order to achieve, if at all, the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office has failed to prove a *prima facie* case of obviousness and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserves the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



/

Hunter E. Webb

Reg. No.: 54,593

Date: August 1, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew